



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

peril the purity of his iambics, or of his Greek and Latin prose, his scholarship is one-sided and incomplete unless he makes himself at home in less familiar epochs, and in fields that have been less assiduously tilled. The two fascinating books of Professor Dill show what a mine of interest, literary as well as historical, lies open for exploration in the later centuries of the Western Empire, and the History of Classical Scholarship by Dr. Sandys, the accomplished public orator of Cambridge, supplies a need from which we have all suffered, and for the first time supplies English readers with a luminous and connected narrative, to use his own words, of "the accurate study of the language, literature and art of Greece and Rome, and of all they had to teach us as to the nature and history of men". Dr. Sandys reminds me of what possibly even some members of the association may have forgotten—the true origin of the term "classical", which forms part of our title, and has given its name to a whole field of learning and research. In the *Noctes Atticae* (XIX 8, 15) Aulus Gellius describes an earlier author as *Classicus scriptor non proletarius*—a metaphor which apparently goes back as far as the division of the Roman people into classes by Servius Tullius. Those who made up the last and lowest are *proletarii*. There are many authors, both ancient and modern, who are more read than they deserve to be; for they belong irretrievably to the proletariat of literature. But I venture to think that in days gone by we have been too subservient to tradition and convention in refusing to admit the title of original and interesting writers to be ranked with the Classics.

Lastly, may I not say, without any disparagement of the great scholars of our youth, that what we call the Classics, whether as an instrument of education or as a field of research, have come to be treated in our time with a larger outlook, in a more scientific spirit, with a quickened consciousness of their relations to other forms of knowledge and other departments of investigation. This is, indeed, a characteristic of the general intellectual movement of our time. It is more and more remarked that the many mansions which go to form the Palace of Knowledge and Truth open out into each other. There is no longer any question of mutual exclusion, still less of absorption or suppression. I was much struck with this on reading the brilliant address delivered this autumn to the assembled representatives of Natural Science by the President of the British Association. It is clear to anyone who reads that address that mechanical theories and explanations no longer satisfy the well-equipped biologist or botanist who has to deal with the problem of living matter even in its rudimentary forms. In like manner the facile and attractive simplicity of many of

the theories which had crystallised almost into dogmas as to Greek origins, Greek religion, the order and development of Greek poetry, and as to a hundred other points, has had to yield to the sapping operations of the comparative method, and is found in the new setting of a larger scheme of knowledge to be hopelessly out of perspective. There is nothing more irksome to the natural man than to have the pre-suppositions on which he has lived rooted up and cast upon the rubbish heap. But this is the often unwelcome service which science is always rendering to the world. Aristotle said long ago that the being that could live in isolation was either above or below humanity. There is no form of study—least of all the study of language and literature, which are the vesture of men's thoughts and conditions—that can afford to isolate itself without incurring the risks of pedantry and sterility. Here is a work which is worthy of the co-operative effort of this Association of scholars. For the literature of the two great European races of the ancient world can never lose its supreme attraction, its incommunicable splendour, and of them it is true in the famous words of Roger Bacon: *Notitia linguarum est prima porta sapientiae*.

SUMMARIES

THE ORIGINALITY OF VERGIL

Under this caption Professor Kroll writes in the *Neue Jahrbuecher*, September, 1908, on Vergil's method of working. I give a summary of the paper. Since Skutsch in his *Aus Vergil's Fruehzeit* proved that the *Ciris*, far from being an imitation of Vergilian poetry, was a poem by Cornelius Gallus, the unfortunate favorite of Octavian, and that the great poet imitated it¹, and since Paul Jahn published his *Studies on the Composition of the Bucolics and Georgics*, no one can doubt that Vergil was far from claiming for himself an absolute independence from predecessors. Thus the sixth Eclogue is a patchwork from the poetry of Gallus, the fourth, besides following in its general outline the precepts of the rhetorical schools on the composition of birthday speeches, imitates Hesiod, Aratus, Catullus, and even the sixteenth epode of Horace. It had been held that the *Georgics* were the most spontaneous product of Vergil's pen, since his predilection for rural life is well attested. Yet even his *vidi* and *memini* in this work is only a way of speaking. In reality Maecenas had called the poet's attention to the fact that this subject had not yet been treated in Latin poetry, and Vergil wrote the *Georgics* after a thorough study of the extant sources, attracted, no doubt, very much by the novelty of the task of recasting the simple language of a Cato and a Varro in the flowery speech of a

¹ See Mackail, *Classical Review*, 22.65—73.

poem². Neither does the poet desire to have his most ambitious work, the Aeneid, viewed as an original production. Nor, indeed, was such desire feasible where the chief moments of the action were a matter of common knowledge. The adventures of the first six books are a conscious parallel to the first half of the Odyssey, the other six to the Iliad, a matter which by now has become hackneyed. The subject matter for the first part he found ready at hand in the Greek mythological handbooks, in Ennius and Varro. For the second half he had the help of Cato's and Varro's Histories, but little material outside of them. To make an epos out of these materials he needed poetical force. For this he went to the great maestro di color chi sanno, to Homer. That the parallel was intentional is clear from the famous reference to the poem even before its finish in Propertius 2. 34. 36, *nescio quid maius nascitur Iliade*. Yet he hardly ever resorted to an absolute translation. Thus in the sixth book the general idea—somewhat superfluous in consideration of the repeated preceding prophecies—was taken from Od. XI, but the description of the funeral from Iliad IX and XXIII, the sacrifice from Apollonius Rhodius, the description of Hades itself from Orphic sources, the return of the hero from Odyssey XIX.

The matter would bear a different aspect, and Vergil would have to be credited with a great and bold invention, if Heinze (Vergil's Epische Technik, second edition) were right in the statement that the theme of the epos is the development of the character of its hero, who only during the course of the narrative and under the stress of his misfortunes becomes the really Pius Aeneas. This statement, however, has met with decided opposition on the part of scholars, and will hardly be approved even by the lay intelligence of mere teachers. If it were true, Vergil would take his place in the epic literature as the worthy peer of a Shakespeare and a Goethe. Perhaps one may claim that the poet makes up for the lack of originality in invention by his plastic descriptions. But in these he is surely not at his best. How weak is the answer which in imitation of Odysseus Aeneas in 1. 378 gives to his mother, how much out of place the laughter of the Trojans when in Book V Menoetes emerges from the water in which he has been hurled, a scene imitated from the *agones* in the Iliad (this latter incident may perhaps be explained as in favor of the Roman poet. To me, at least, it seems as if Vergil had transferred, by conscious anachronism, the attitude of the Roman populace of his age to the time of his hero).

Thus we are confronted by the problem: how, in spite of all these drawbacks, could Vergil achieve

such immediate and almost unanimous approval? We can hope to understand this phenomenon only if we put ourselves into the mental attitude of his contemporaries. As most poetical subjects had been treated over and over again, glory was achieved by clothing old matters in a new form. And this held good at the time not only of poetry, but also of prose. The theory of style had been fully and fulsomely developed (see on this topic the excellent remarks of Norden in his *Antike Kunstprosa*); conformance to rules was valued above everything.

Now Callimachus had in his masterful manner condemned the large (cyclic) epos: a great book is a great evil, was his final judgment. For this tedious product he had substituted the Epyllion, an episodic epic of moderate length, comparable to the relation of the short story in our times to the three volume novel of fifty years ago. His example had set the fashion for Rome in the boyhood of our poet. The *novi poetae* walked piously in the footsteps of their master, and Vergil himself has incorporated such an epyllion in the Aristaeus episode of his Georgics. At this juncture Augustus approached the great poets of his time with the demand to celebrate his accession to the throne with a great historic poem. Horace and Propertius both had firmly, though politely, refused his behest, but he had better success with the softer Vergil, even though inclination and self-introspection showed him his weakness. But being the child of his age he could not divest himself of the tendencies of that age. Though cyclic in form, in spirit the Aeneid still is an epyllion, and of decided Alexandrian character. The interest of the poet is centered in the dramatic and pathetic effects; hence he is at his best in those books which lend themselves to these effects, the most successful among them being the fourth book. Alexandrian also are certain matters of form. Thus we must interpret his remodelling of verses of Gallus, Varius, and others as compliments to these men in the fashion of the poets of the age of the Diadochi. Thus, to quote but one instance, Catullus says in his Berenice of the queen's lock, *Invita, o regina, tuo de vertice cessi*, which in Vergil has been put into the mouth of Aeneas at his meeting with Dido in Hades in this form: *invitus, regina, tuo de litore cessi*.

Next to the influence of Alexandria the age of Vergil is characterized by the overwhelming influence of rhetorical teaching, which has been so amusingly described by the elder Seneca. Vergil, of course, had enjoyed a thorough rhetorical training. That is plainly apparent in the most successful parts of his epic, the speeches, many of which admit of being outlined in strict accordance with rhetorical precepts. In them we find all the devices of the text books, with their incessant use of the figures of

² For a different and, I think, sounder account see Ferrero, *Greatness and Decline of Rome* (English Translation), 3.296—305, especially 304.—C.K.

speech on which Norden has lavished such erudition.

In this, then, we must seek the mystery of the enormous success of the Aeneid. What his contemporaries admired in the poet was not the matter but the form. It is an altogether different question on what the secret of the continued charm of the epic really is based. How the Romans of the outgoing paganism were wont to rave about the master's knowledge is a matter of common possession, no less than that during the Middle Ages the poet enjoyed the dubious fame of an archmagician. Rightly does Kroll demand that somebody should undertake a book on Vergil in the manner of Zieliński's Cicero during the Centuries. On this subject much might be said even now, but I am afraid I have already overstepped the limits of a mere summary. My only excuse is that Vergil is one of the very few ancient writers who are still favored with a certain measure of popularity. E. R.

Mr. Luther R. Moffitt, of Grand Rapids, Michigan, has issued a small four-page pamphlet entitled A Review of the Inflection of Latin Nouns. In the prefatory note he states:

This is not meant to be a substitute for drill, but a basis for drill and an aid to the memory. The several points mentioned should be fully illustrated by examples, by drill, or by both together. The teachers should, of course, thoroughly understand this simple little system before beginning to use it. It aims to make the true analysis (into stem and case-ending) as clear as the present fictitious analysis ('base' and 'termination'), and in so doing to give a historically correct unification of the noun inflection. The chief sources are White's Beginner's Greek Book and Collar and Daniell's Beginner's Latin Book.

Then follows a table giving the assignment of a noun to its declension by its stem, then the case-endings of the different declensions arranged according to Masculines and Feminines, with examples, and a table of endings. The third page gives explanation of the variations in the different declensions and different stems. I quote this:

The second declension stems lose their last letter *o* before *i* always, and change the *o* to *u* in the nominative and accusative singular. (This last change was not made in early Latin, but came about gradually for ease of pronunciation). If the stem ends in *ro*, the nominative drops *o* and ends in *-er*, *e* being put in if not found in the stem: *agro-*, *ager*; *puero-*, *puer*.

And this:

Consonant stems of the third declension insert *e* or *i* between the stem and the case-ending in all cases except the nominative and dative singular and genitive plural; *i* being used in the genitive singular and the dative and ablative plural, elsewhere *e*. Some consonant stems are weakened in sound in all cases except the nominative singular: *princip-* for *princep-*; *virgin-* for *virgon-*.

A few remarks on Neuters, the Vocative case and directions how to recognize *i* stems close the pamphlet.

When a man aims to make a true analysis as clear as the previous fictitious one and in so doing to give a historically correct unification of the noun inflection, he might be expected to select some other sources than White's Beginner's Greek Book and Collar and Daniell's Beginner's Latin Book. Doubtless the analysis into base and termination has its objections; but on the other hand Mr. Moffitt's "unification" is certainly not historically correct. There are some queer things in Latin declension which grammarians are not yet thoroughly agreed upon. It seems strange that *-bus* should be the ending of the Dative and the Ablative of the fifth declension, and that *i* should be the ending of the Genitive of the fifth declension. Mr. Moffitt says that the fifth declension is perfect, having no irregularities of any kind in the making of the cases, but adds that two only of its nouns have all the cases in the Singular and Plural, which seems to be remarkable, in view of the previous statement. However, many will think that such criticisms are captious, and no doubt this little scheme, like other similar schemes, has its value for those who wish to teach declension in this way. It is very questionable, after all, if it is not better to memorize the declensions and help the retention of them by such rational observations and explanations as seem to be demanded than to learn the variations first and trust to luck for the former. But capable teachers are bound by no rules and should be bound by none. G. L.

At Syracuse University, on Tuesday, December 29, in connection with the meeting of the State Teacher's Association, there will be a Classical Conference. At this writing, unfortunately, details of the programme are not at hand. Information may, however, be obtained from Professor Frank Smalley, Syracuse University, Syracuse, N. Y.

At the first luncheon of The New York Latin Club, held on November 22, there was a most gratifying attendance. Professor Thomas D. Goodell of Yale University spoke most interestingly on Some Present Aspects of the Question; the paper dealt with the teaching of Greek, and is to appear in The Classical Journal.

At this luncheon it was decided that two or three additional meetings of The New York Latin Club shall be held annually. At these meetings there are to be no luncheons; practical problems of the school-room are to be considered. Our information is that the first of these extra meetings will be held on Saturday morning, January 9, and that the topic will be The Place of Latin Writing in the Schools and the best Way to teach it. Information may be obtained from Mr. J. Clarence Smith, 430 Fourth Street, Brooklyn.